



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/943,784	08/31/2001	Frank Grant	MPZ-100-A	1041
7590	10/03/2003		EXAMINER [REDACTED]	NILAND, PATRICK DENNIS
Denise M. Glassmeyer Young & Basile, P.C. Suite 624 3001 West Big Beaver Road Troy, MI 48084			ART UNIT [REDACTED]	PAPER NUMBER 1714
DATE MAILED: 10/03/2003				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/943,784	GRANT, FRANK	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Patrick D. Niland	1714	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.

- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-41 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____ .
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ .

1. Claims 1-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A. It is unclear what is encompassed by the instantly claimed melt flow rate because the temperature and pressure under which the melt flow rate is determined is not specified. The ordinary skilled artisan will understand that these parameters materially affect this measured value.

B. It is unclear what is meant by "includes" in the instantly claimed group of sizing polymers. This is not proper Markusch group language. See MPEP 2173.05(h)

Alternative Limitations

I. MARKUSH GROUPS

Alternative expressions are permitted if they present no uncertainty or ambiguity with respect to the question of scope or clarity of the claims. One acceptable form of alternative expression, which is commonly referred to as a Markusch group, recites members as being "selected from the group consisting of A, B and C." See *Ex parte Markus*, 1925 C.D. 126 (Comm'r Pat. 1925).

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.


3. Claims 1-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pat. No. 5643989 Van De Grampel et al..

Van De Grampel discloses melt kneading a mixture of functionalized polypropylene and glass fibers sized with sizing falling within the scope of the instantly claimed size and stamping the resulting laminate into the desired product, which falls within the scope of the instantly claimed molding step. The patentee is silent as to the intantly claimed melt flow index. As noted above, the instantly claimed melt flow index is not clearly claimed. It is the examiner's position that, under some combination of temperature and pressure, the patentee's polypropylene will necessarily possess the instantly claimed melt flow index inherently. See the abstract; column 1, lines 18-67, particularly 27 and 36-56; column 2, lines 1-12; column 6, lines 29-67; column 7, lines 1-11; column 8, lines 22-25; column 11, lines 36-67; column 12, lines 1-67; column 13, lines 1-21; column 16, lines 43-45; and the remainder of the document. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to use the combinations of ingredients of the instant claims and the molding processes of the instant claims in the molding method of Van De Grampel and their resulting articles because they are encompassed by the patentee and would have been expected to give the improved properties disclosed by the patentee. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to make the instantly claimed battery trays using the above discussed method because the improved properties that result in a product of sufficient properties to make a bumper would have been expected to make a superior battery tray also with a lower likelyhood of any tabs for holding an ABS module of breaking off due to the increased physical properties disclosed by the patentee.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrick D. Niland whose telephone number is 703-308-3510. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 10am to 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan, can be reached on (703) 306-2777. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.



Patrick D. Niland
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1714